

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Keith A. Smyth,)	Civil Action No.: 0:21-cv-00649-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Bryan Stirling, <i>Director</i> ; Chelsea Johnson,)	
<i>Program Manager, I.C.S.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”)¹ of the United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, who recommends denying Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction [ECF No. 42] as moot and denying Plaintiff’s motion for judgment as a matter of law [ECF No. 48]. *See* ECF No. 82.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Plaintiff has not filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.² In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting

¹ The Magistrate Judge issued the R & R in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.).

² Plaintiff’s objections were due by January 24, 2022. See ECF Nos. 82 & 83.

the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

Having found no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's R & R [ECF No. 82], and Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction [ECF No. 42] and Plaintiff's motion for judgment as a matter of law [ECF No. 48] are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
February 9, 2022

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
Chief United States District Judge